

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed January 3, 2007 in which claims 21-26 are pending.

The specification has been objected to because it contains a computer program listing that has more than 300 lines of program code.

In addition, claims 21-26 have all been rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Marchisio, U.S. Pat. No. 6,510,406.

Response To Objection To Specification

With respect to the objection to the Specification, enclosed herewith is a CD-ROM containing a “computer program listing appendix” submitted in duplicate in accordance with 37 CFR 1.77(b), 1.52(e)(5), 1.96(b) and 1.96(c) containing a *verbatim* copy of the source code labeled “Appendix A” from page 44 through page 147 of the application as filed.

In addition, the Specification has been amended to add the required incorporation by reference and remove the computer program text from the portion of the application that will publish. Withdrawal of the objection to the Specification is now respectfully requested.

Response To Claim Rejections

In order to anticipate a claim, it is mandatory that a reference disclose each and every element of the claim as claimed. If even a single element is not met by the reference, the claim is not anticipated. Accordingly, with respect to the rejection of claims 21-26, the rejection is respectfully traversed. In short, other than through use of the same words, albeit in a different context, Marchisio has little to do with the instant application. The instant invention relates to navigation among a hierarchically arranged group of nodes, whereas Marchisio is concerned

with database optimization. As set forth below, and in contrast to the assertions in the Office Action, Marchisio does not anticipate the pending claims for the following reasons.

First, the Office Action states that Marchisio discloses claim 21's "creating a first matrix comprising a correlation of at least some thesaurus words with at least some keywords" citing col. 11, lines 5-10. This is incorrect. Marchisio discloses a matrix correlating keywords to documents. Marchisio's correlation is not what is claimed. Accordingly, claim 21 is not anticipated.

Moreover, claim 21 further recites "creating a second matrix by calculating cosine values from a co-occurrence analysis of the entries in the first matrix." Since the alleged "first matrix" of Marchisio is different than what is claimed, then it cannot anticipate claim 21 since it does not disclose what is claimed. Still further, as a substantive matter, Marchisio discloses calculating cosine values between keywords and documents – not thesaurus words and keywords. This is an independent reason why Marchisio does not anticipate claim 21. Accordingly, claim 21 is not anticipated and is allowable.

Claims 22-26 all depend from claim 21. As a result, if claim 21 is not anticipated, then claims 22-26 can not be anticipated either. Accordingly, they are also not anticipated for the same reasons.

Still further, the reference to "frequency" cited in rejecting claim 22 does not disclose, and has nothing to do with, "tracking the frequency of use of the nodes." Accordingly, claim 22 is not anticipated and is allowable for this separate and independent reason.

Claim 23 recites “ranking the nodes based upon a result of the tracking” whereas Marchisio discloses something very different, ranking a document against a query. Accordingly, claim 23 is not anticipated and is allowable for this separate and independent reason.

The rejection of claim 24 is improper. Normalizing the statistics of term frequency counts is neither a disclosure of, nor has anything to do with, the recited “pruning a node from the group . . .” as recited in that claim. Accordingly, claim 24 is not anticipated and is allowable for this separate and independent reason.

With respect to claim 25, Marchisio does not perform an unknown word analysis. The cited adding of a row in Marchisio has nothing to do with unknown word analysis, let alone being a disclosure of what is claimed in claim 25. Accordingly, claim 25 is not anticipated and is allowable for this separate and independent reason.

With respect to claim 26, the cited passages of Marchisio disclose nothing about deleting a learned entry, let alone doing so based upon satisfaction of a frequency of use criterion. Marchisio’s disclosure of normalization of frequency counts has nothing to do with learned entries and the mention of “a data driven learning model” relates to something different. Accordingly, claim 26 is not anticipated and is allowable for this separate and independent reason.

Since all of the claims are not anticipated for the above reasons, all of the claims are allowable and early, favorable action in this regard is requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event any issues remain that could potentially be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below. Should any

PATENT
Docket No.: 4428-4001US2

additional fee(s) be required for the entry of this Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby
authorized to charge Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. **4754-4000US2**.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN

Dated: April 2, 2007

By:



Richard Straussman
Reg. No. 39,847

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Address associated with:

Customer No. **27123**